Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/656,688	EASTMAN, ROBERT
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hugh B. Thompson II	3634

All Participants:

(1) _Hugh B. Thompson II(PTO)_.

(2) _Mr. William Blackman_.

Status of Application: _non-final_

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: _10 February 2005_   **Time:** _2pm(approx)_

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☐ No
  If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
_n/a_

Claims discussed:
_1-16,20-25_

Prior art documents discussed:
Oxford-628, Murphy-159

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: .
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(signature)
(Examiner/SPE Signature)   (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant agrees to add the "valveless" language to claim 12, and to claims 6 and 22, the language requiring that the "reinforcing member is more than twice as thick as the outer layer." These changes serve to distinguish over the Oxford and Murphy references. .